DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 079 SO 024 245

AUTHOR Juul, Thomas P.; Repa, Theodore
TITLE A Survey To Examine the Relationship of the Openness of Self-Identified Lesbian, Gay Male, and Bisexual Public School Teachers to Job Stress and Job Satisfaction.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 47p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Homosexuality; *Job Satisfaction; Lesbianism; *Public School Teachers; Quality of Working Life; Questionnaires; Secondary School Teachers; Social Science Research; Stress Variables; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Background; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Morale; Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS Bisexuality; *Homosexual Teachers

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a study to improve and enrich understanding of how the disclosure or non-disclosure of a lesbian, gay male, or bisexual teacher's sexual orientation at work influences his or her perceptions of job satisfaction and job stress. Consideration was given to the general level of job satisfaction and job stress among lesbian, gay male, and bisexual teachers as contrasted to previous studies using the same instrumentation with assumed heterosexual populations. Differences among the three affectional identity groups were examined in the areas of job satisfaction, job stress, and identity disclosure. Membership in a gay teacher organization was appraised as a factor. Supplementary analysis was undertaken to assess the effects of tenure, age, level of school, type of community, and AIDS deaths on job satisfaction, job stress, identity, and demographic variables. This study was concerned only with the effects of openness on job satisfaction and job stress. The significance of being either open or closeted about one's sexual orientation at work influenced the perceived levels of job stress and job satisfaction of lesbian, gay male, and bisexual teachers. Eight appendices contain: (1) definitions of factors in the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ); (2) teacher stress items from LPCQ; (3) definition of factors/Level of Professional Challenge Questionnaire (LPCQ); (4) the Identity Disclosure Questionnaire (IDQ); (5) definitions of IDQ factors; (6) demographic data section; (7) cross tabulation of type of community by affectional identity with number, percent of row, and percent of column; and (8) summary of significant results by variables across instrument factors. (Contains 20 references.) (DK)

ED 378 079

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
THOMAS P. JUUL
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

A Suvey to Examine the Relationship of the Openness of Self-Identified Lesbian, Gay Male, and Bisexual Public School Teachers to Job Stress And Job Satisfaction

Thomas P. Juul
Theodore Repa

American Educational Research Association
1993 Annual Meeting
April 12-16, Atlanta, Georgia
Session 20.30 Giving Voice to the Lives of Lesbians, Gay Males and Bisexuals in School Settings

SP 024 245

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Remarks

Thirty-eight years ago the United States Supreme Court changed the course of American public education with its unanimous decision in the Brown vs. The Board of Education, Topeka cases. A lesser known fact about these cases was how important a role social research played in supporting the legal arguments placed before the court (Blaustein & Ferguson, 1957; Bagwell, 1972). Researchers were able to substantiate with studies of black children that discrimination caused lowered self-esteem and negative self-images which were carried into adulthood. Research also confirmed that discrimination caused harm to those who were discriminated against, as well as to those who practiced it (Clark, 1953). While this idea has become self-evident and reasonable today, with the possible exception of gay and bisexual people, this was not a universally accepted view at the time of the Brown decision. Segregation was said to benefit both races. And at the time, large numbers of people believed that segregation did benefit both races. We now generally accept both the idea that "separate can not be equal" and that discrimination is harmful. Thirty-eight years ago as the Mattachine Society and Daughters of Balitis were taking shape, as forerunners of the gay liberation movement (Berube, 1991), a scholarly meeting of educational

researchers, such as this, to discuss gay and lesbian life would have been inconceivably.

Fifteen years later in 1969, the legal questions of "separate but equal" and discrimination by color or race were generally resolved after considerable conflict. After the inception of the gay liberation movement with the Stonewall Rebellion (Duberman, 1991), a serious scholarly meeting of educators would have been possible; however, the participants would have been for the most part been assumed heterosexuals, and the focus for the discussions would have been from outsiders studying a sexual minority.

Today we are gathered together under the aegis of the prestigious American Educational Research Association to discuss a wide variety of subjects which have as a common thread lesbians and gay people. Of those in attendance, many, if not a majority, are likely to be lesbian or gay, and if one is a lesbian or gay male college or university professor, they are most likely, fairly open about their sexual orientation (Juul, 1993). The research study which I bring to this discussion, like the now self-evident social research in the Brown case, may be viewed by those lesbians and gays in attendance as self-evident, however this is may not be the case for many heterosexuals. As the American Negro knew from experience, that discrimination hurts, we as lesbians and gay people know that release from oppression

and secrecy allows for individual growth and happiness. What this researcher found was that those people who hold the homosexual secret at work were less satisfied with the interpersonal and self-realizing aspects of job satisfaction, and were far more stressed by issues related to sexual orientation than those who were open at work. While less obvious than segregation to the general public, discrimination against gay people still has the force of law in some states under the guise of sodomy or morals, such as the sodomy laws here in Georgia, the argument that opposes being open about ones sexual orientation is not only the law, but the idea that to discuss a non-heterosexual orientation is to flaunt ones sexuality.

This is not a discussion of the benefits of being open versus flaunting ones sexuality; however, this discussion is held in this atmosphere and general context. To overstate the issue, when planning to attend this conference in this city, I felt a like Jews attending an academic conference in Berlin in 1938, concerned, yet safe, and very aware of our brothers and sisters who live in fear. We should not forget, for an instant, that by coming to this conference in this state, we placed ourselves in jeopardy. We should not allow the organizers of such a prestigious gathering of academic minds to forget what they have asked of us, and we should demand a safe site for all members and guests in the

selection of future conference sites. What I hope to achieve with my research is no less than what Kenneth B. Clark achieved with his research, freedom for my people, so that they may be more fully realized human beings and fully accepted members of their various communities.

Purpose of Study

In recent years, lesbian and gay people have increasingly become the locus of researcher's interests. This increased interest has, in the last decade, included lesbian and/or gay male teachers (Delon, 1984; Harbeck, 1987, 1989, 1992; Juul, 1993; Mayer, 1992; Nickeson, 1980; Olson, 1987; Smith, 1985; Woods, 1990). The purpose in the majority of these studies has been to document the fact, and the impact of oppression and discrimination on gay teachers. And like the early studies of homosexuals, many of these studies compare homosexual teachers to heterosexual teachers. Generally, the comparison studies of teachers find little in the way of significant differences between heterosexual and homosexual teachers. No research had been conducted with lesbian and gay male teachers as to the relationship of the openness of self-identified lesbian, gay male, and bisexual public school teachers to job satisfaction and job stress at work.

The purpose of the study was to improve and enrich our understanding of how the disclosure or non-disclosure of a lesbian, gay male, or bisexual teacher's sexual orientation at work influences his or her perceptions of job satisfaction and job stress. Consideration in the study was also given to the general level of job satisfaction and job stress among lesbian, gay male, and bisexual teachers as contrasted to previous studies using the same instrumentation with assumed heterosexual populations. Differences between the three Affectional Identity groups (lesbian, gay male, and bisexual) were examined in the areas of job satisfaction, job stress, and identity-disclosure. Membership in a gay teacher organization was appraised as a factor in job satisfaction, job stress, and identity. Supplementary analysis was undertaken to assess the effects of tenure, age, level of school, type of community, and AIDS deaths on job satisfaction, job stress, identity, and demographic variables. Today's presentation is concerned only with the effects of openness on job satisfaction and job stress.

Weigert, Teitge, and Teitge (1986) provided a theoretical framework for the interaction of a lesbian or gay male persons self-identity with their social-identity. Gays and bisexuals engage in a struggle to balance their need for a personal identity, with those of an occupational group identity as a teacher which is assumed to be

heterosexual. For gays and bisexuals the lack of congruency and integration with the heterosexual assumption creates dissonance. Seeking an occupational (social) identity may mean limiting gay or bisexual identity. By establishing a gay or bisexual (self) identity one may limit his social identity. Complete consonance for gay people within the heterosexual society may be difficult since public respectability is a component of social identity.

> A self-realizing homosexual (or bisexual), for example, might also become socially realized if she or he were to gain public respectability within a community or region dominated by other homosexuals or tolerant heterosexuals. (Weigert, et al, 1986, p. 86)

Weigert, et al., (1986) see this conflict between personal and occupational identity for homosexuals as a social/self realization matrix, with consonant and dissonant identity factors affecting occupational outcomes based on the priority of self or social identity. The greater the emphasis on self-realization, the greater the potential social estrangement. The greater the emphasis on social realization, the more potential personal dissonance.

The present study focused on the personal and occupational identity choices (disclosure or non-disclosure) lesbian, gay male, and bisexual teachers made, and the effect disclosure or non-disclosure had on job stress and job satisfaction. The significance of being either open or closeted about one's sexual orientation at work influenced the perceived levels of job stress and job

satisfaction of lesbian, gay male, and bisexual teachers (Weigert, et al., 1986).

Method

One of problems in gathering a sample of lesbian, gay male, and bisexual public school teachers was that circumstances demand that many of these teachers lead hidden lives. The researcher was able to located eighteen gay and/or lesbian teacher organizations which he contacted by mail asking for their help in distributing a survey of job satisfaction and job stress. In addition, several phone conversations were held with members of these organizations to answer questions related to privacy and the nature of the survey. All contact with survey participants was through participating organizations. Approximately fourteen hundred survey packets were distributed through thirteen of these gay and/or lesbian teacher organizations in April and May of 1992.

Members of participating lesbian and gay teacher organizations were sent a packet which contained two copies of the survey instrument, a cover letter, and two return envelopes. By requesting the teacher who received the initial mailing to pass the second copy of the survey along to a known lesbian, gay male, or bisexual teacher who was not a member of a gay and/or lesbian teacher organization

the survey was snowballed. Snowballing enlarged the sample size and provided a sampling group of gay teachers who were not associated with a gay and/or lesbian teacher organization. A follow-up post card was sent by the participating organizations to their members two weeks after the initial mailing. Dillman's (1978) procedures were be followed as regards survey format, layout and size. Nine hundred and four usable surveys were returned prior to the cut-off date in July of 1992. Summaries of participation by states by Affectional Identity are included in Table 1. The response rate based on membership was approximately 43.6% (611 of 1400) for members, and 20.6% for non-members (289 of 1400). If the assumption is made that only those member teachers who responded gave a know colleague the second survey, the response rate for the snowball would be approximately 47.3% (289/611).

Measures

Three instruments were used in the survey. The Teacher Jobs Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ, 66 items) was constructed by Paula E. Lester (1983). It was specifically designed for use with teachers. The instrument was factored by its author and was found to have nine factors. However, when the TJSQ was factored by the researcher a fourteen

Table 1

Returned Surveys by State by Affectional Identity (Missing N=12)

State	Lesbian	Gay male	Bi-sexual	Total
Alabama	3	1		4
Arizona	6	2		8
Arkansas	2	1		3
California	68	81	12	161
Colorado	50	24	9	83
Connecticut	5	8	1	14
Delaware		2		2
D.C.	1	1		2
Florida	4	7	1	12
Georgia		3	1	4
Hawaii		2	1	3
Illinois	21	8	2	31
Indiana	17	4	1	22
Iowa	4		2	6
Kansas		2		2
Kentucky	2		1	3
Maine	2	2	2	6
Maryland	2	2		4
Massachusetts	22	9	4	35
Michigan	25	40	5	70
Minnesota	9	2		11
Mississippi	2			2
Missouri	5	5		10
Montana		1		1

Table 1

Returned Surveys by State by Affectional Identity (Missing N=12)

State	Lesbian	Gay male	Bi-sexual	Total
Nebraska	8	2	1	11
New Hampshire	1	1	1	3
New Jersey	31	27	2	60
New Mexico	3			3
New York	30	48	2	80
Ohio	23	38	5	66
Oklahoma		1		1
Oregon	1	3	1	5
Pennsylvania	1	11		12
Rhode Island	1			1
South Carolina	1			1
Tennessee	2			2
Texas	15	10	4	29
Vermont	3			3
Virginia		2		2
Washington	12	2		14
West Virginia		1	1	2
Wisconsin	56	23	11	90
Foreign	1	6	1	8
Total	439	382	71	892

factor solution was found (alpha .937, for definitions see Appendix A). The fourteen factors were found to be most

appropriate for use with this sample. The second instrument was the Level of Professional Challenge Questionnaire (LPCQ, 32 items, alpha .839). The LPCQ was a modification of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). The MBI was modified with 10 lesbian/gay teacher specific stress questions (see Appendix B). The researcher confirmed a four factor solution (see Appendix C for definitions). No instrument was found for the measurement of gay identity or openness. The researcher developed the Identity-Disclosure Questionnaire (IDQ, 33 items, alpha .885)(Appendix D). A sample survey was constructed and administered (N=193) to a gay population. The final instrument was factored and a six factor solution was used (for definitions see Appendix E). Demographic and openness of relationship data was also collected (Appendix F).

Openness Variables

Openness was a conceptual variable which required the creation of operational variables. Two operational variables, Teacher Openness (Topen) and Administrative Openness (Admopen) were constructed from the data. The third openness operational variable used the data from question 21 of the Identity Disclosure Questionnaire (IDQ21) (Appendix D) directly. Item 21 from the Identity-Disclosure Questionnaire was also used to formulate the variable

Table 2

Cross Tabulation of Variables
Teacher Openness (Topen) with
Administrative Openness (Admopen)

Admopen Topen	Not open	Neutral	Open	Total Percent
Not open	372	17	15	404 46.3
Neutral	127	27	34	188 21.5
Open	59	50	172	281 32.2
Total Percent	558 63.9	94 10.8	221 25.3	873 100.0

Teacher Openness (Topen). Item #21 asked teachers to respond to the statement, "I am out at work."

Using IDQ21, Topen reorganized the responses into three groups, Strongly agree and agree into open, Strongly disagree and disagree into not open, and neutrals. Topen was considered a subjective evaluation of openness.

The operational variable (Admopen) used the relationships section of the Demographic Data Survey (Appendix F). Teachers were asked to objectively evaluate whether their orientation was known by their immediate supervisor and employer, and how it became known. The mean of the response(s) was used to create the variable Administrative Openness (Admopen). Three groups were formed. Means

between 1.0 and 2.99 were labeled "open." Means between 3.01 and 6.0 were the "not open" group. A means of 3.0 composed the neutral group. Table 2 is a cross tabulation of the two operational openness variables.

Results

Results indicate that those teachers who were more open about their sexual orientation at work displayed significantly greater job satisfaction on personal and idiographic dimensions of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ)(Tables 3, 4, 5) than those teachers who were more closeted. There were no statistically significant differences between open and closeted teachers on non-personal or work place factors. When subjective (Topen)(see Table 3) and objective (Admopen)(see Table 4) stances on openness were assumed in evaluating results of the TJSQ, the results indicated three common or core factors. These were Personal Responsibility, Security, and Students. In addition to the core factors, subjective and objective perspectives each emerged with three different significant factors which placed emphasis on different idiographic factors within the TJSQ. The subjective perspective

Table 3

One-Way Analysis of Variance of
Significant Teacher Job Satisfaction Factors
by Teacher Openness (Topen)
Groups 1) Not open, 2) Neutral, 3) Open

Factor	Gp	Mean	SD	F	Prob.
Colleagues[1]	1	29.70	4.69	4.34	.0133
	2	30.47	4.05		
	3	30.68	4.82		
Personal respons.[2]	1	12.55	1.71	4.16	.0159
	2	12.52	1.60		
	3	12.90	1.78		
Professional develop.[3]	1	9.59	2.37	2.88	.0568
	2	9.83	2.26		
	3	10.03	2.44		
Security[4]	1	10.85	2.48	3.04	.0485
	2	11.02	2.44		
	3	11.32	2.55		
Students[5]	1	16.37	2.09	5.56	.0040
	2	16.34	2.05		
	3	16.86	2.13		
Teaching[6]	1	13.09	1.87	4.55	.0108
	2	13.36	1.69		
	3	13.49	1.71		

Table 3

One-Way Analysis of Variance of
Significant Teacher Job Satisfaction Factors
by Teacher Openness (Topen)
Groups 1) Not open, 2) Neutral, 3) Open

Pairs of groups significantly different @ .05

[1] Not Open and Open
[2] Not Open and Open
[3] Not Open and Open
[4] Not Open and Open
[5] Neutrals and Open; Not Open and Open
[6] Not Open and Open

accentuated the inter-personal factors of Colleagues, Professional Development, and Teaching. Subjective openness indicated greater satisfaction from an expanded social intercourse with staff and students, an apparent lessened sense of isolation, which led to greater job satisfaction in these areas when compared to closeted teachers. The objective perspective placed the emphasis on the self actualizing factors of Creativity, Recognition, and Supervision. Apparently, those teachers who were more open with administrators received more satisfaction from their role within the building than those who were not fully disclosed. These teachers also appear more willing to be noticed for their achievements.

Table 4

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Significant Teacher Job Satisfaction Factors by Administrative Openness (Admopen) Groups 1) Not open, 2) Neutral, 3) Open

Factor	Gp	Mean	SD	F	Prob.
Creativity[1]	1	16.70	2.49	3.73	.0243
	2	16.97	2.24		
	3	17.24	2.51		
Personal respon.[2]	1	12.53	1.71	3.79	.0229
	2	12.75	1.71		
	3	12.90	1.73		
Recognition[3]	1	13.22	3.16	2.95	.0529
	2	14.01	3.27		
	3	13.59	3.31		
Security[4]	1	10.83	2.44	3.56	.0288
	2	11.47	2.41		
	3	11.19	2.65		
Students[5]	1	16.33	2.05	3.97	.0193
	2	16.72	2.03		
	3	16.76	2.29		
Supervision[6]	1	44.09	10.10	3.12	.0448
	2	45.86	9.71		
	3	45.89	10.45		

Table 4

One-Way Analysis of Variance of
Significant Teacher Job Satisfaction Factors
by Administrative Openness (Admopen)
Groups 1) Not open, 2) Neutral, 3) Open

Pairs of groups significantly different @ .05 and Notes:

[1] Not Open & Open
[2] Not Open & Open
[3] No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level
[4] No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level
[5] Not Open & Open
6 No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level

In examining the extremes of open and closeted teacher groups, deeply closeted teacher responses closely mimicked neutral and slightly open teachers (see Table 5). In the study of extreme groups, the primary differences were between strongly open teachers and those who were not open, as opposed to those who were deeply closeted. Education is an inordinately social profession, and as such, the importance of interpersonal relations with colleagues and students is extreme. Those teachers who were more open about their sexual orientation experienced greater satisfaction on the personal and interpersonal dimensions of the TJSQ. Open teachers were conspicuously more satisfied.

Table 5

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Significant TJSQ Factors by IDQ21 (I am out at work), Groups 1) Strongly disagree , 2) Disagree 3) Neutral, 4) Agree, 5) Strongly agree

Factor	GP	Mean	SD	F	Prob.
Colleagues[1]	1	29.59	5.05	2.45	.0448
	2	29.78	4.39		
	3	30.47	4.05		
	4	30.44	4.59		
	5	30.98	5.10		
Personal respons.[2]	1	12.68	1.76	3.47	.0080
	2	12.45	1.67		
	3	12.53	1.60		
	4	12.73	1.74		
	5	13.11	1.82		
School policies[3]	1	8.51	1.26	2.38	.0503
	2	8.36	1.27		
	3	8.48	1.26		
	4	8.41	1.22		
	5	8.78	1.41		
Security[4]	1	10.82	2.59	3.80	.0045
	2	10.87	2.40		
	3	11.02	2.44		
	4	10.93	2.40		
	5	11.82	2.65		

Table 5

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Significant TJSQ Factors by IDQ21 (I am out at work), Groups 1) Strongly disagree , 2) Disagree 3) Neutral, 4) Agree, 5) Strongly agree

Factor	GP	Mean	SD	F	Prob.
Students[5]	1	16.50	2.23	3.91	.0037
	2	16.27	1.96		
	3	16.34	2.05		
	4	16.67	2.16		
	5	17.11	2.08		
Teaching[6]	1	13.10	1.83	3.29	.0108
	2	13.08	1.90		
	3	13.36	1.69		
	4	13.30	1.72		
	5	13.73	1.66		

Pairs of groups significantly different @ .05

[1] Strongly Disagree & Strongly Agree
[2] Disagree & Strongly Agree; Neutrals & Strongly Agree
[3] Disagree & Strongly Agree
[4] All groups & Strongly Agree
[5] Disagree & Strongly Agree; Neutrals & Strongly Agree
[6] Disagree & Strongly Agree; Strongly Disagree & Strongly Agree

They appeared more able to engage in the social and interpersonal role expectations associated with being a teacher.

Openness had a confined influence on the four factors of the Level of Professional Questionnaire (LPCQ). The primary factor affected by openness was Identity Dissonance (ID). Those teachers who were more open experienced significantly less stress related to their sexual orientation than those who were closeted. The application of the subjective (Topen)(see Table 6) and objective (Admopen)(see Table 7) perspectives to the LPCQ showed one additional significant result, which was associated with the objective viewpoint. Teachers who were more open with their administrators experienced a significantly greater sense of Personal Accomplishment (PA) from their teaching than those who were not open with administrators. This finding is consistent with TJSQ objective results in that teachers who were open with administrators were ostensibly more willing to accept recognition of their teaching, and possibly public recognition of their sexual orientation. There were no significant difference between groups for Emotion Exhaustion (EE) or Depersonalizate (DP). It is also notable that open teachers do not appear to experience significantly more stress than closeted or neutral teachers. The results imply no increase in dissonance associated with being open as is implied in Weigert, et al., (1986). For lesbian, gay male,

Table 6

One-Way Analysis of Variance
Level of Professional Challenge
by Teacher Openness (Topen),
Groups 1) Not open, 2) Neutrals, 3) Open

Factor	Gp	Mean	SD	F	Prob.
EE	1	24.46	11.67	.25	.7787
	2	23.78	11.24		
	3	24.11	10.62		
ID[1]	1	33.33	12.15	167.89	.0000
	2	24.12	12.06		
	3	16.24	10.51		
PA	1	39.25	6.55	2.26	.1049
	2	39.78	6.49		
	3	40.30	6.01		
DP	1	7.69	5.64	2.61	.0736
	2	7.17	5.77		
	3	6.72	4.98		

Pairs of groups significantly different @ .05

[1] Open and Neutral; Open and Not Open;
Neutral and Not Open

and bisexuals the lack of congruency and integration with the heterosexual assumption did not create greater dissonance as expressed in greater work related burnout or stress. The aspect of public respectability as a component of social identity did not appear to cause open teachers greater stress or burnout.

Table 7

One-Way Analysis of Variance
Level of Professional Challenge
by Administrative Openness (Admopen),
Groups 1) Not open, 2) Neutrals, 3) Open

Factor	Gp	Mean	SD	F	Prob.
EE	1	24.23	11.40	.24	.7847
	2	24.56	10.73		
	3	24.85	11.07		
ID[1]	1	30.22	13.08	87.64	.0000
	2	18.28	12.27		
	3	17.87	10.97		
PA[2]	1	39.15	6.61	3.92	.0201
	2	40.01	5.41		
	3	40.55	6.16		
DP	1	7.49	5.51	.42	.6542
	2	7.08	5.50		
	3	7.16	5.41		

Pairs of groups significantly different @ .05

[1] Open and Not Open; Neutral and Not Open
[2] Not Open and Open

Table 8

One-Way Analysis of Variance for Level of Professional Challenge by IDQ21, Groups 1) Strongly disagree, 2) Disagree 3) Neutral, 4) Agree, 5) Strongly agree

Factor	Gp	Mean	SD	F	Prob.
EE	1	24.85	11.97	.26	.9032
	2	24.15	11.80		
	3	23.78	11.24		
	4	24.34	10.04		
	5	23.80	11.35		
ID[1]	1	37.05	11.04	104.68	.0000
	2	30.29	12.18		
	3	24.12	12.06		
	4	19.47	10.65		
	5	12.39	8.95		
PA	1	39.15	6.95	1.53	.1911
	2	39.33	6.23		
	3	39.78	6.49		
	4	39.87	5.65		
	5	40.83	6.41		
DP	1	7.87	5.73	1.63	.1656
	2	7.54	5.57		
	3	7.17	5.77		
	4	7.00	4.91		
	5	6.37	5.08		

Table 8

One-Way Analysis of Variance for
Level of Professional Challenge by IDQ21,
Groups 1) Strongly disagree, 2) Disagree
3) Neutral, 4) Agree, 5) Strongly agree

Pairs of groups significantly different @ .05

All Groups with Each Other

[1] Strongly Agree & Agree; Strongly Agree & Neutral; Strongly Agree & Disagree; Strongly Agree & Strongly Disagree; Agree & Neutral; Agree & Disagree; Agree & Strongly Disagree; Neutral & Disagree; Neutral & Strongly Disagree; Disagree & Strongly Disagree

Coming Out

There appear to be benefits in the form of increased job satisfaction and decreased job stress in being open at work about ones sexual orientation for public school teachers; however, the decision to come out at work is a deeply personal and environmental one. The reality of the situation also demands caution as many states may consider state laws to revoke gay rights protection. Those lesbian and gay teachers who are out in state which evoke or instigate new anti-gay laws may suffer extreme consequences. Nothing in this study is intended to be interpreted as a reason to come out.

References

Berube, A. (1990). Coming out under fire; The history of gay men and women in World War Two. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Bagwell, W. (1972). School Desegregation in the Carolinas; two case studies. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina.

Blaustein, A. P. & Ferguson, C. C., Jr. (1957). Desegregation and the law: The meaning and effect of the school segregation cases. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Clark, K. B. (1953). Desegregation, An appraisal of the evidence. Journal of Social Issues, 9(4), 1-80.

Delon, F. (1984). Dismissal of public school teachers for immoral conduct. Paper presented at a meeting of the Kentucky Council of School Attorneys, September 29, 1984. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 794)

Duberman, M. (1991). Hidden from history: the gay and lesbian past. Lecture, Museum of Natural History, February 21 and February 28, 1991.

Hammersmith, S. K., & Weinberg, M. S. (1973). Homosexual identity: Commitment, adjustment, and significant others. Sociometry, 36(1), 56-79.

Harbeck, K. M., ed. (1992). Coming out of the classroom closet; Gay and lesbian student, teachers and curricula. New York: Harrington Park Press.

_____. (1989). The homosexual educator: Past history/future prospects. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 27-31, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 016)

_____. (1987). Personal freedoms/public constraints: An analysis of the controversy over the employment of homosexuals as school teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Juul, T. P. (1993). A survey to examine the relationship of the openness of self-identified lesbian, gay, and bisexual public school teachers to job stress and job satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.

Lester, P. E. (1982). Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. (Available from Dr. P. E. Lester, C.W. Post University, Old Westbury, NY).

_____. (1983). Development of an instrument to measure teacher job satisfaction. unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S. E. (1981). Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Mayer, M. P. (1992). Gay, lesbian, and heterosexual teachers: An investigation of acceptance of self, acceptance of others, affectional dna lifestyle orientation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of San Francisco.

Nickeson, S. (1980). A comparison of gay and heterosexual teachers on professional and personal Dimensions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.

Olson, M. (1987). A study of gay and lesbian teachers. Journal of Homosexuality, 13(4), 73-79.

Smith, D. (1985). An ethnographic interview study of homosexual teachers' perspectives. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Albany.

Weigert, A. J., Teitge, J. S., & Teitge, D. W. (1986). Society and identity: Toward a sociological psychology. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Woods, S. E. (1990). The contextual realities of being a lesbian physical educator: Living in two worlds. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Appendix A

Definition of factors
Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ)

Definition of eight factors of Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire from Lester (1982) Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire Manual (*), and six from survey factor analysis.

1. Administrative policies - Teachers attitudes towards the ability of the district administration to communicate its policies.
2. Advancement - The opportunity for promotion.*
3. Colleagues - The work group and social interaction among fellow teachers.*
4. Creativity - The opportunity to use new methods and skills.
5. Pay - Annual Income.*
6. Personal responsibility - The opportunity to be accountable for one's own work.*.
7. Professional Development - Attitudes towards suggestions for improving teaching from colleagues and supervisors.
8. Recognition - Some act of notice, blame, praise, or criticism.*
9. School policies - Awareness of and interest in school level polices.

10. Security - The school's policies regarding tenure, seniority, layoffs, pension, retirement, and dismissal.*
11. Students - Interaction with students.
12. Supervision - The task-oriented behavior and person-oriented behavior of the immediate supervisor.*
13. Teaching attitudes - feelings towards teaching itself.
14. Working Conditions - The working environment and aspects of the physical environment.*

Appendix B

Teacher stress items/LPCQ

1. I feel that I am passing as heterosexual at work.
2. I feel being out has made my job easier.
3. I feel being gay prevents me from having close relationships with co-workers.
4. I feel conflicted about coming out at work.
5. I feel staying in the closet is best in my situation.
6. I feel that I have to lead a double life at school because I am gay.
7. I worry about co-workers finding out that I am gay.
8. I feel being openly gay presents many potential hazards.
9. I feel that if co-workers knew I was gay I would have more problems.
10. I hate the way being gay makes me feel at work.

Appendix C

Definition of Factors/ Level of Professional Challenge (LPCQ)

1. The Emotional Exhaustion subscale assesses feelings of being emotionally overextended and exhausted by one's work.*
2. The Depersonalization subscale measures unfeeling and impersonal response towards recipients of ones service, care, treatment, or instruction.*
3. The Person Accomplishment subscale assesses feelings of competence and successful achievement in one's work with people.*
4. The Identity Dissonance subscale assesses feelings of stress related to a gay and bisexual sexual identity in the work environment.

* Maslach, C. & Jackson, S.E. (1981)

Appendix D

IDENTITY-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: The following statements refer to factors that can influence the way you feel about gay life and your job. These factors are related to work, stress and to the individual's perceptions of gay life. When answering the following statements, circle the numeral which represents the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement. Please circle only one response for each item.

Key: 1 STRONGLY DISAGREE	2 DISAGREE (neither disagree nor agree)	3 NEUTRAL	4 AGREE	5 STRONGLY AGREE

1.	I associate socially almost exclusively with gay people.	1	2	3	4	5
*2.	I wish I were not homosexual.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I am out only to myself.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	When at work I seek out other gay co-workers for companionship.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I am out only to a small group of gay friends.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I am out to my straight friends.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I am out to a least one other co-worker.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Gay people should be open about their sexual orientation with adolescents.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I am involved in a gay civil right group.	1	2	3	4	5

Key: 1 STRONGLY DISAGREE	2 DISAGREE (neither disagree nor agree)	3 NEUTRAL	4 AGREE	5 STRONGLY AGREE

10.	I have been identified in a gay context in the public media.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I am a spokesperson for gay issues.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	I am gay.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Being out at work fights homosexual stereotypes.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I prefer the company of other gay people.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	I am probably a homosexual and I do not like it.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I am passing as heterosexual at work.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I limit contact with heterosexual people.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	These are my people.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	How dare you assume I am heterosexual.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I do not care if they know.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I am out at work.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	I know gay teachers who are not out at work.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I have merged my public and private lives.	1	2	3	4	5

Key: 1	2	3	4	5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE (neither disagree nor agree)	NEUTRAL	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE

24. I present myself as being straight by going out with a member of the opposite sex.	1	2	3	4	5
*25. I would not want to give up my homosexuality even if I could.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I demonstrate affection to other gays when in public.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I am bisexual.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I present myself as being straight by changing pronouns.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I present myself as straight by laughing at derogatory gay jokes.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I should be working for gay civil rights at my job.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I feel being openly gay at work is not important.	1	2	3	4	5
32. It is important to me to be open about my gayness.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I present myself as straight by being silent whenever sexual issues are brought up.	1	2	3	4	5

*Commitment to identity- Hammersmith and Weinberg

Appendix E

Definitions of IDQ Factors

1. Going Public items tended to reflect the higher level of identity models, represented degree of public disclosure and willingness to accept public roles.
2. Identity Integration represents the dissonance between accepance of affectional identity and social identity.
3. Exposure delineates the boundaries of a willingness to disclose oneself to others.
4. Separatism represent the degree of homo-social isolation or lack of interest in socializing with the heterosexual population.
5. Commitment to Identity is a person's satisfaction with his or her present identity as a future identity (Hammersmith & Weinberg, 1973).
6. Identity Acceptance - Respresent items which reflect lower levels of identity models, and acceptance of one sexual orientation.

Appendix F

Demographic data section

Below you will find demographic questions, please write your answers clearly. Circle your answers for the remainder of the questions.

1. Your Gender 1. Female 2. Male
2. Ethnicity
    1. American Indian or Alaskan Native
    2. Asian or Pacific Islander
    3. Black (not of Hispanic Origin)
    4. Hispanic (of Hispanic Origin regardless of race)
    5. White (Not of Hispanic Origin)
    6. Other _____
3. Age (in years) _____
4. Years Teaching _____
5. Years in Present School _____
6. Type of School in which you teach?
    1. Elementary 2. Middle School
    3. Junior H.S. 4. High School
    5. Other _____

7. Subject Area\Assignment:

   1. Elementary Classroom Teacher

   2. Art 3. English 4. Library 5. Math 6. Music

   7. Physical Education 8. Reading 9. Science

   10. Social Studies 11. Special Education

   12. Administration

   13. Other_____

8. Type of school?

   1. Urban 2. Suburban 3. Rural

9. State in which you teach? _____

10. State in which you were raised? _____

11. Are you tenured? 1. Yes 2. No

12. Are you in a committed relationship?

    1. Yes 2. No

13. Are you a member of a Lesbian/Gay Teachers' Organization? 1. Yes 2. No

14. Are your civil rights (as a gay teacher) protected by: A. State Law 1. Yes 2. No

    B. Local Ordnance 1. Yes 2. No

    C. Union Contract 1. Yes 2. No

15. Are you a member of a Lesbian/Gay Civil Rights Organization? 1. Yes 2. No

15. Have you been married? 1. Yes 2. No

16. Do you have children? 1. Yes 2. No

Demographic questionnaire part two

Below you will find five general questions please circle your answers.

1. Taking all things together, how would you say things are these days... Would you say you are,

   1. very happy 2. pretty happy 3. or not too happy?

2. If a gay high school student should come to you and say, that he or she would like to be a teacher would you,

   1. encourage or 2. discourage them?

3. If you had your life to live over, would you choose teaching again?

   1. Yes 2. No

4. Have you lost a domestic partner or committed lover To AIDS?

   1. Yes 2. No

5. A. Have you lost a close friend(s) to AIDS in the last year?

   1. Yes 2. No

   B. If so have you lost?

   1. One 2. Two 3. Three or more

   friends in that time?

Demographic data Section III

Directions: Below you will find a list of people to whom you may or may not be open about your sexual orientation. We are concerned with two aspects of these relationships, 1) whether you are out to the person(s) and 2) how you came out to them. Regardless of the quality of the relationship, please mark your response using the scale below. If the person is deceased describe the status of the relationship prior to their death. Use a zero "0" if not applicable.

Key:

0 NOT APPLICABLE

1 I CAME OUT TO THEM

2 SOMEONE TOLD THEM

3 THEY KNOW

4 I AM NOT SURE IF THEY KNOW

5 I DO NOT THINK THEY KNOW

6 THEY DO NOT KNOW

_____ Mother

_____ Father

_____ Step-Parent

_____ Sister ____ Sister ____ Sister ____ Sister

_____ Brother ____ Brother ____ Brother ____ Brother

_____ Extended Family Members (Aunts, Uncles, Cousins Grandparents)

_____ Employer

_____ Immediate Supervisor

If appropriate

_____ Spouse

_____ Child ____ Child ____ Child

APPENDIX G

Cross Tabulation of Type of Community by Affectional Identity with Number, Percent of Row, and Percent of Column

Type	Lesbian	Gay male	Bisexual	Total
Missing	6	6		12
	50.0	50.0		1.3
	.7	.7		
Urban	182	168	35	385
	47.3	43.6	9.1	43.2
	41.5	44.0	49.3	
Suburban	166	162	24	352
	47.2	46.0	6.8	39.5
	37.8	42.4	33.8	
Rural	76	39	12	127
	59.8	30.7	9.4	14.2
	17.3	10.2	16.9	
Other	10	7		17
	58.8	41.2		1.9
	2.2	1.9		
Total	439	382	71	892
	49.2	42.8	8.0	100.0

APPENDIX H

Summary of Significant Results by Variables Across Instrument Factors; Columns 1) Topen, 2) Admopen, 3) Membership in Gay/Lesbian Teachers Group, 4) Membership in Civil Rights Group, 5) Gender, 6) Tenure, 7) In Relationship, 8) Type of School (incl. College), 9) Type of Community, 10) Death of Friend, 11) Region of Country Significant groups differences LE< .05 (x)

Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Supervision		x				x	x				
Colleagues	x										x
Pay						x	x		x	x	
Advancement						x		x			
Working cond.							x		x		
Students	x	x			x	x	x	x			
Professional Dev.	x					x		x		x	
Creativity		x			x	x					x
Recognition		x				x	x	x			

APPENDIX H

Summary of Significant Results by Variables Across Instrument Factors; Columns 1) Topen, 2) Admopen, 3) Membership in Gay/Lesbian Teachers Group, 4) Membership in Civil Rights Group, 5) Gender, 6) Tenure, 7) In Relationship, 8) Type of School (incl. College), 9) Type of Community, 10) Death of Friend, 11) Region of Country Significant groups differences LE< .05 (x)

Security	x	x			x	x					x
School policies								x			
Teaching	x				x	x		x			x
Admin. policies							x				x
Personal respon.	x	x									x
LPCQ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Emotional ex.						x		x			
Identity dis.	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
Personal acc.		x			x	x	x	x			
Depersonalization					x		x	x			

APPENDIX H

Summary of Significant Results by Variables Across Instrument Factors; Columns 1) Topen, 2) Admopen, 3) Membership in Gay/Lesbian Teachers Group, 4) Membership in Civil Rights Group, 5) Gender, 6) Tenure, 7) In Relationship, 8) Type of School (incl. College), 9) Type of Community, 10) Death of Friend, 11) Region of Country Significant groups differences LE< .05 (x)

IDQ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Going Public	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x
Integration	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x
Exposure	x	x	x	x		x		x		x	x
Separatism				x	x		x		x		x
Commitment	x	x	x	x	x		x		x		
Acceptance	x	x	x	x	x		x		x		x